UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,563	01/26/2004	Darren Ronald Boisjolie	69448-00020USPT	4037
61060 WINSTEAD PO	7590 02/24/200 C	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 5078		DANG, THANH HA T		
DALLAS, TX 7	/3201		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2163	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/24/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/766,563	BOISJOLIE ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Thanh-Ha Dang	2163		

	mann-na bang	2103	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 09 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Arno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS			e appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	•	ΓE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reig	acted claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reju	scied ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment (PTOL-324)
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		inpliant Amendment (1 10L-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timaly filed amondmor	at cancaling the
non-allowable claim(s).	owable ii subifilited iii a separate,	uniely nieu amenumei	it canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	I sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.		n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	F I O/SD/00/ Maper INO(S).		
/don wong/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2163			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8 and 10-13 have been considered but they are not persuasive. The Examiner respectfully maintains the rejection cited for the following reasons: Applicant argues: Applicant respectfully submits that neither Easty nor Dutta discloses the claim 8 feature of providing, in a client application, modules for performing content rating and content filtering.

Examiner responds: Examiner is not persuaded. Dutta teaches the claim 8 feature of providing, in a client application, modules for performing content rating and content filtering in Figures 4, 5, 6 and 7; wherein Figure 4 illustrates client device (410) that inherently includes client application [0017]; wherein modules for performing content rating and content filtering are illustrated in Figure 5 (530, 550), Figure 6 (630), and Figure 7 (730); [0033] wherein the client device sends content requests to the personalized accessibility evaluation provider and receives filtered content from the personalized accessibility evaluation provider, wherein the term "content" as it is used in the present description is intended to mean any electronic information that is retrievable and able to be provided to a client device, wherein content may be web pages including web pages generated using hypertext markup language, wireless markup language, and the like, applications, images, and the like, wherein the term "filtered content" is intended to mean content that has been evaluated for accessibility and compared to user designated accessibility requirements. Thus, the process of comparing, filtering and evaluating content inherently includes rating, and therefore Dutta's teaching read on the above claimed limitation.

Applicant argues: Applicant respectfully submits that neither Easty nor Dutta discloses the claim 8 feature of, for a plurality of monitored computers, utilizing the client application to capture in real time all requests for data as the monitored user accesses digital content. Examiner responds: Examiner is not persuaded. Dutta illustrates in Figure 1 a plurality of monitored computers represented by client device and servers. Easty teaches in Figures 3 and 4 column 7 lines 14-22 wherein a signal is received from a client, affinity information is captured therefrom and user profiles are updated in real time using the affinity information that read on utilizing the client application to capture in real time all request for data as the monitored user accesses digital content claimed limitation. Therefore, Dutta in conjunction with Easty teaches the elements of claim 8.